

Jewish people's exclusive rights in Israel

 conservativenewsandviews.com/2016/06/08/editorial/guest/jewish-people-exclusive-right-israel/

Before discussing the Jewish People's exclusive right to the Land of Israel, (Eretz Israel) artificially designated as "Palestine," we shall first review the character and credibility of the Muslims who claim this ancestral Jewish land as their own.



Muslim claims: bunk

We begin by citing Professor Ephraim Karsh. Karsh, an Israeli-British historian, is the founding director and emeritus professor of Middle East and Mediterranean Studies at King's College London. Since 2013, he has served as professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University (where he is also a senior research associate at the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies).

Karsh quotes the eminent Arab-American historian Philip Hitti who, in 1946, described the common Arab view: "There is no such thing as Palestine in history, absolutely not." Palestine was never "perceived as a distinct entity deserving national self-determination but as an integral part of a unified regional Arab order." If Hitti is correct, the Arab claim to Palestine has no valid historical foundation, a polite way of say the Arab claim is a hoax, or to put it bluntly, the Arabs are engaging in prevarication.

This unflattering conclusion about the Arabs conforms to the assessment of Professor Yehoshafat Harkabi, erstwhile Director of Israel Military Intelligence, a key architect of the 1993 Israel-PLO Agreement who, despite his unfavorable opinion of Arab culture, opted for a Palestinian state.

The Arab mind

Although Harkabi is a self-professed cultural relativist, this does not deter him from baldly stating in *Arab Attitudes to Israel* (Jerusalem: Keter 1972): "the use of falsehood" and "distortions of the truth" are typical of Arab political life – surely a derogatory evaluation. "Political scientists, sociologists and historians," he musingly writes (alluding to Americans), "seem to feel reluctant to mention this aspect of their analysis of the Arab world" (p. 337). Harkabi goes so far as to say that mendacity is "second nature" to Arabs, that one may rightly regard "falsehood an expression of [Arab] national character." To clinch his argument he quotes Arab sociologist Sonia Hamady: "Lying is a widespread habit among the Arabs, and they have a low idea of truth" (p. 348).

Nicolai Sennels, a Danish psychologist, paints a more complicated if not more dismal picture. He maintains that massive inbreeding within the Muslim culture during the last 1,400 years may have done catastrophic damage to their gene pool. He contends that the consequences of intermarriage between first cousins often have serious impact on the offspring's sanity. His seemingly racist theory that Muslims are inclined to violence and rape has been receives some credibility if we consider the recent invasion of Muslim migrants into Europe. The Muslim aggression and sexual assaults now rampant in Europe has transformed pacifist Europe into bedlam.

Sennel attributes this mayhem to Muslim beliefs and culture. If this diagnosis is correct, one may reasonably conclude that Islam, notwithstanding its refinements, is a schizophrenic or pathological religion! There is collateral historical evidence supporting this seemingly racist conclusion. After all, both Japan and China are warrior cultures, but their bellicosity is mild compared to Islam, in view of two facts. First, of the 1.5 billion Muslims on planet earth, it has been estimated by scholars that as much as 80 percent of the world's Muslim population supports Jihad! Second, this high estimate of an Islamic predilection to bloodshed has been rendered plausible by a study conducted by the Center for the Study of Political Islam. Thus, according to the Center's February 21, 2007 issue of *FrontPageMagazine*, Muslims have slaughtered approximately 270 million people since the ascendancy of Muhammad!

Although I have a mountain of documentary evidence that makes this incredible number credible, let it suffice to state that Hafez Assad's suppression of the Muslim Brotherhood in Syria ended in the 1982 massacre in the city of Hama, costing the lives of about 20,000 people.

Islam's taste for blood was gruesomely displayed in a ceremony that took place in Syria on the tenth anniversary of the Yom Kippur War. I watched the ceremony on Israel television. Here is how it is described in the October 21, 1983 issue of the *Jerusalem Post Magazine*:

Syrian militia trainees [male and female] put on a show for Syrian president Hafez Assad. Martial music reached a crescendo as Syrian teenage girls suddenly bit into live snakes [some four or five feet long], repeatedly tearing off flesh and spitting it out as blood ran down their chins. As Assad applauded, the girls then attached the snakes to sticks and grilled them over fire, eating them triumphantly. Others [militiamen] then proceeded to strangle puppies and drink their blood.

Koranic roots of Muslim mayhem

The reader does not need to be an Israeli or a Jew to ascertain who the snakes, the puppies, and the blood represent. What he does need to know is that when Muslims use their own children to kill Jews, this is not, as some sheltered academics would have us believe, an example of "radical" Islam. No, more exemplary of Islam and more praiseworthy than using one's own children to kill Jews is for the Muslim to heed Sura 9:111 of the Qur'an, which exalts the Muslim who "slays and is slain for Allah"!

Sura 9:111 expresses the most distinctive and supreme religious imperative of Islam. This imperative manifests the Muslim's pagan love of death or necrophelia. Necrophelia is nothing less than a horrible mental disorder, a pathological love of death. Islam's pathological love of death is probably the basic reason why Syrian-born psychiatrist Wafa Sultan, who now lives in America, does not regard Islam as a civilization. Her conclusion is confirmed by the philosopher Lee Harris in *Civilization and Its Enemies*.

Harris, who rejects the cultural relativism prevalent in Western universities, defines civilization as having four prerequisites: (1) a stable social order, (2) the co-operation of individuals pursuing their own interests, (3) the ability to tolerate or socialize with one's neighbors, and (4) a hatred of violence. To the preceding I would add (5) a respect for truthfulness, a quality precluded by the Muslim doctrine of taqiyya, according to which deceit and dissimulation are virtues.

The prerequisites of civilization mentioned above are consistent with classical liberalism, which maintains that men can be friends despite their differences. Classical liberalism may be related to the Judaic concept of man's creation in the image of God, a concept congruent with the inviolability of the individual. Islam regards the concept of man's creation in the image of God as blasphemous, because the paramount attribute of Allah is absolute or unqualified Will in contradistinction to Reason, whose law of non-contradiction limits the absolute power attributed to Islam's deity.

A clash of civilizations, or between civilized and savage

More than any other aspect of Islam, its denial of man's creation in the image of God signifies, and as 9/11 verifies, that we are witnessing what American professor of political science Samuel Huntington and British professor of history Bernard Lewis call a "clash of civilizations" between Islam and the West." This clash is irreconcilable.

For reasons of his own, however, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu denied the existence of this clash in a speech to a joint session of the American Congress on July 10, 1996 (<http://mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFA-Archive/1996/Pages/PM%20Netanyahu-%20Speech%20to%20US%20Congress-%20July%2010-%201996.aspx>.) This is a "politically correct" but fragile facade for his futile peace negotiations with the Palestinian Authority (PA), now running beyond its second decade and despite thousands of Jewish victims of Palestinian terrorism.



Surely by now it should be transparent to any candid observer that genuine and abiding peace between the PA and Israel is psychologically and politically as well as theologically impossible.

[Easy Plugin for AdSense](#) by [Unreal](#)

We are thus left on the treadmill of the murderous and monotonous "peace process" that was born with the 1993 Oslo or Israel-PLO Agreement which Mr. Netanyahu has honored like a battered wife. This battered wife syndrome afflicts Israeli politicians, regardless of which party is in power.

Dangerous moral equivalency

This syndrome, however, should not obscure the moral and legal aspects of Israel's dilemma. By fostering the notion that Israel and the Palestinian Authority, difficulties aside, are seriously engaged in the pursuit of peace, Netanyahu has fostered the pernicious doctrine of moral equivalency, that is, he has obscured the irreconcilable cleavage between these "partners": one a Jewish democracy, the other an Islamic despotism.

Netanyahu has thus placed Judaism, a religion that exalts peace, on the same level as Islam, which exalts war. In other words, Judaism, which is based on the primacy of reason and persuasion, has thus been rendered no better than Islam, a creed based on the primacy of force and coercion. And if Jews respect transparency and truth, Muslims practice taqiyya, the veiled art of deception and dissimulation.

Netanyahu thus fosters not only moral equivalency. He also purveys the cynicism of Israel's enemy! Hence he has ignored the warning of the prophet Isaiah: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil." As a consequence, the nation led by this clever but philosophically shallow politician is in deep trouble. While he can think nothing loftier than security, he gives the enemy more time to magnify Israel's insecurity.

Meanwhile Israel's friend, the U.S., another democracy steeped in cynicism, concludes a nuclear arms deal with Iran, the spearhead of Islam. Islam has solemnly vowed to wipe Israel off the map, while gleefully chanting "Death to America." These threats are rendered possible by nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles, which the mullah's of Teheran, animated by their love of death, may use to hasten Islam's redeemer, the Mahdi and paradise!

Negotiation, Jewish rights, and the UN Charter

Now let's consider another aspect of this bizarre and horrendous state of affairs. Netanyahu's "negotiating" with the Palestinian Authority, a terrorist organization, should also be understood as a violation of the United Nations Charter. The Charter not only proscribes terrorism; it also obliges all members of the UN, including Israel, to punish transgressors of the Charter.

Israel's Prime Minister has repeatedly violated this aspect of the Charter by releasing terrorists. Moreover, he has also rewarded terrorists with Jewish land in violation of various international conventions such as the 1920 San Remo Conference, which incorporated the Balfour Declaration, as well as the Anglo-American Treaty of 1925, all of which are still valid. Before continuing, we must elaborate on San Remo.



On 24-25 April 2010, the European Coalition for Israel conducted a number of educational seminars delivered by spokesmen from the United States and Canada. It was followed by a ceremony held in San Remo at the same villa where the San Remo declaration took place in 1920. The event attracted politicians from Europe, the U.S. and Canada. Deputy Knesset Speaker Danny Danon delivered greetings from Jerusalem.

At the conclusion of the commemoration, a statement was issued reaffirming the importance of the San Remo Resolution (which included the Balfour Declaration) in shaping the map of the modern Middle East. Bear in mind that the Resolution was agreed upon by the Supreme Council of the Principal Allied Powers of World War I (Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, with the U.S. acting as an observer). Note, too, that the Resolution was approved unanimously by the League of Nations, and that it remains irrevocable and legally binding to this day.

The commemoration statement also emphasized that the San Remo Resolution of 1920 recognized the exclusive national Jewish rights to the Land of Israel under international law, on the strength of the historical connection of the Jewish people to the territory previously known as Palestine.

San Remo thus gave birth to the "Mandate for Palestine," in effect a League of Nations document that laid down the Jewish legal right to settle anywhere in western Palestine, a 10,000 square-mile area between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. Fifty-one member countries – the entire League of Nations – unanimously declared on July 24, 1922: "Whereas recognition has been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country," Jews are in the Land of Israel as of right and not on sufferance. This recognition was affirmed by the Anglo-American Treaty of 1925, which was signed by the President of the United States and ratified by the U.S. Senate thus making it the supreme law of the land.

Any attempt to negate the Jewish people's right to Palestine (Eretz-Israel) and to deny them access and control over the area designated for the Jewish people by the League of Nations, is a serious infringement of international law as well as a violation of the American Constitution.

How the 2-state solution violates international law and even the American Constitution!!!

The following are collateral points which were confirmed at San Remo and which support Israel's borders from the Mediterranean Sea to the Jordan River:

If there were any historical connection for Arabs to Palestine, it was rejected in 1920 by the Supreme Council of the San Remo Convention, which, under the authority of the League of Nations, adjudicated the case after extensive representations by the Arabs.

Once San Remo was approved, Britain, the “Mandatory” of Palestine, the League of Nation, and the United Nations, had no right to change the terms of these conventions and treaties. These agreements thus became Res Judicata – the principle that a matter may not, generally, be re-litigated once it has been judged on the merits.

Any attempt to negate the Jewish people’s right to Palestine-Eretz-Israel, and to deny them access and control over the area designated for the Jewish people by the League of Nations is a serious infringement of international law.

It follows from the above stated legal facts and considerations that the so-called two-state solution, which entails Arab control of any part of Judea and Samaria, violates the San Remo Convention of 1920, as well as the Anglo-American Treaty of 1925, hence by extension the Constitution of the United States, and must therefore be deemed null and void under international law, regardless of any statement to the contrary issued by U.S. President Barack Obama and/or by Israel’s Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. ✧

